

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the subject application. Claims 7, 8 and 12 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to pursue subject matter affected by this cancellation/amendment in co-pending related applications. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-6 and 9-11 and 13-19 will be before the Examiner for consideration.

The drawings are objected on the alleged grounds that the components of claim 8 are not illustrated. The cancellation of claim 8 obviates this objection. Reconsideration is requested.

The abstract is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Applicant asserts that the amendment above obviates this rejection. Reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has renumbered the misnumbered claims 8-18 to 9-19. Applicant has amended the dependency of the claims based on this renumbering.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant asserts that the amendments to claims 9 and 10 obviate this rejection. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogilvie Jr. et al (6029582, '582 patent). Applicants believe that the amendments to claims 1, 4, 18, and 19 obviate this rejection. Nowhere does the '582 patent teach an edge panel which defines a jack passage. Indeed, the '582 patent does not contemplate an edge panel that is designed to fold up to form a protective wall structure feature to assist in maintaining the peripheral integrity of an assembly. In turn, the '582 patent cannot be said to suggest an edge panel which defines jack passages. The jack passages are important to the protective wall feature formed by the edge panel to allow

the jack entry into the assembly for moving purposes. In light of the absence of any such feature in the '582 patent, as well as the absence for the need of such feature, the '582 patent fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 4, 18, and 19. Further, dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are not anticipated. In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this 35 USC § 102(b) rejection.

Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Haywood et al. Applicant asserts that the cancellation of claims 7 and 12 obviate this rejection. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Chilcutt et al. Applicant asserts that the amendment to claims 9 and 10 obviate this rejection. Further, this rejection as it relates to dependent claim 11 is obviated in light of such amendment. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over the '582 patent in view of Haywood et al. Applicant asserts that the cancellation of claims 7 and 8 obviate this rejection. Reconsideration is requested.

Applicants believe that all claims are in a condition for allowance, and request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any aspect of this response. In addition, the Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned to arrange a telephonic interview if the Examiner believes that not all grounds for rejection have been addressed and overcome.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy H. Van Dyke
Reg. No. 43,218
Beusse Wolter Sanks Mora & Maire P.A.
390 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801
Phone: (407) 926-7726